

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application and claims 32 – 37 were previously cancelled.

In the Advisory Action of September 25, 2008, the Examiner stated that Applicant's arguments filed on September 12, 2008, in response to the claim rejections presented in the Final Office Action of April 17, 2008, were not persuasive.

In this Amendment, Claims 5 – 13, 19, 20, and 26 - 29 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this Amendment. Claims 1 – 31 remain at issue.

On October 16, 2008, a phone interview with the Examiner was initiated by Applicant's Agent, Kader Gacem, to discuss remarks made by the Examiner's in the Response to Arguments section of the Advisory Action.

I. Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during a telephone conference held on Thursday October 16, 2008 with Applicants' agent, Kader Gacem.

During the phone interview, Applicants' agent and the Examiner discussed the rejections under 35 U.S.C § 102(e). The Examiner and Applicants' agent discussed independent Claim 1.

With respect to Claim 1, Applicants' agent directed the Examiner's attention to her remark that Applicant has not claimed "determining whether a security identification can be authenticated before it is presented to a firewall control block or Java complaint applet." Applicant's agent further commented that although the exact wording of the above-cited quotation is not recited, independent claim 1 does recite the following equivalent limitation "wherein the security context block presents the first security identification to the first firewall control block responsive to determining that said first security identification can be authenticated."

In response, the Examiner agreed with Applicant's agent as to the equivalency between the two phrasings and suggested that Applicant specifically points out in the response to the Advisory Action where the above-cited limitation of claim 1 is supported.

In addition, the Examiner requested that the trademark symbol "TM" accompanying the Java and Java Card wordings be removed from the claims.

II. 35 U.S.C. §102(e) Anticipation rejection of claims

Claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Montgomery, et al.* (“*Montgomery*”) (U.S. 7,127,605). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

As required by the Examiner, Claims 5 – 13, 19, 20, and 26 – 29 have been amended to remove the symbol “TM” that accompanies the wordings “Java” and “Java Card” recited in these claims.

As stated in the Response to the Final Office Action filed on September 9, 2008, independent claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 21, and 27 each claim subject matter relating to determining whether a first security identification can be authenticated before it is presented to a firewall control block. When it is determined that the first security identification can be authenticated, then the first security identification is presented to a firewall control block or JavaTM compliant applet.

As requested by the Examiner during the phone interview, Applicant hereby lists a couple of paragraphs of the published patent application 2005/0138354 that disclose the last cited limitation of Claim 1 (emphasis added):

[0020] Similar to a firewall security block, a security context block can be provided for various components of the computing system (e.g., Java.TM. applets, Java.TM. packages). In fact, it is possible to provide both a firewall security block and security context block for a single component. Furthermore, it should be noted that a security context identification (ID) provided in a security context block can be used as a security identification that is presented to a firewall control block. As will be appreciated, cryptographic operations (e.g., authentication) can be performed before the security context identification (ID) is presented to the firewall control block. *This means that a security Identification can first be authenticated before it is presented to the firewall control block.* After successful authentication, the firewall control block can be used to determine whether the security Identification identifies an associated component with access privileges. Thus, the combination of the firewall control block and security context block can further enhance security of the computing environments.

[0092] *In any case, if the random string is verified, the authentication process if successful (i.e., it can be assumed that the rightful owner of the security ID1 is using the security ID 806). Accordingly, if the authentication process is successful, the security management JavaTM applet 820 forwards the authenticated security ID (ID1) to the second JavaTM applet 822. As will be appreciated, the second JavaTM applet 822 can, for example, use the authenticated security ID1 as an associate identification in a similar manner as discussed above. This means that a firewall control block 830 can be provided*

for the second JavaTM applet. The firewall control block 830 can, for example, be the firewall control block 630 of FIG. 6D. As such, the second JavaTM applet 820 can use the authenticated security ID1 as the associate identification 642 (shown in FIG. 6D) to determine whether an associate is attempting to access it and what operation should be allowed.

As remarked in the previous response, *Montgomery* fails to teach determining whether a first security identification can be authenticated before presenting it to a firewall control block or JavaTM compliant applet. Thus, *Montgomery* fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 21, and 27.

Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-20, 22-26, and 28-31 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 21 or 27 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 21, and 27 are allowable.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-31 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner finds that there are any outstanding issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 17, 2008

By: /Kader Gacem/
Kader Gacem
Registration No. 52,474
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000